



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Reclamation District 2035	County	Yolo
Project Title	RD 2035 Conjunctive Use and Environmental Enhancement Program	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 450,000.00

Project Description: The Proposal develops the Conjunctive Use and Environmental Enhancement Program to integrate surface water and groundwater resources and increase water supply reliability for agricultural, urban, and environmental interest located along the lower Sacramento River and north Delta region.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	10
Budget	1
Schedule	2
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	28

- **GWMP or Program:** The Applicant formally adopted a GWMP on April 25, 1995, and included the meeting minutes describing GWMP adoption signed by the General Manager. A copy of the document was also included.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The Applicant supplies a complete and detailed description of the proposed. The Description identifies that the proposal is designed to increase potential opportunities for increasing water supply reliability to agriculture, urban, and environmental interests in Yolo County and the North Delta region by developing a conjunctive use optimization model. The Applicant states that it is committed to continue to fund the maintenance of the model developed from the project and to update relevant portions of the GWMP with the project results after the grant is expended. However, the applicant does not offer a specific plan for future monitoring beyond basing them on the results of the final project report. The applicant includes a general commitment by the RD 2035 Board of Directors to determine the level of funding required to carry out ongoing monitoring without committing itself to a specific minimum level of funding.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant's WP adequately describes in sufficient detail what will be done and what the product will be, especially Tasks 3 and 5. Tasks are consistent with the Schedule and Budget and will reasonably support the objectives of the proposal. In addition, in part because task 6 is devoted to updating their GWMP, the tasks certainly relate to improving GW management. Because the project consists of data collection and evaluation, and data collection is limited to existing facilities that presumably the Applicant already has access to, access does not appear to be at issue. Likewise, although the Applicant does not mention CEQA, as the project is comprised of data collection efforts, the project is likely exempt from CEQA review and permitting.
- **Budget:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The Applicant's Budget grand total of \$450,000, exceeds the PSP's maximum grant amount of \$250,000. Because the total project cost is well over the maximum \$250,000 available from the grant, the applicant should be showing cost share to provide for the difference in total project costs and the maximum grant amount. In addition, it does not include necessary detail to show that the estimates are realistic and cost effective in meeting the proposal's objectives. For instance, no mention of specific staff personnel needed per task, nor the number of labor hours, nor any direct costs or potential consultant fees are provided.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Schedule:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. Although the Applicant includes timelines that are within the PSP's maximum allowable 2-year window and seem somewhat optimistic given the overall breadth of the project, the timelines for the amount of work appear to be not reasonable, allowing only 1-month lags between the four major overlapping tasks, so it is hard to understand how preceding tasks will adequately inform subsequent tasks. The applicant does not present appropriate detailed description within the Gantt chart; all subtasks are depicted as a point on the chart, without showing that the Applicant has logically thought out the necessary order of the subtasks, or how long each will realistically take to complete. The proposed start date is January 2013, but the Applicant provides no narrative to show that they will be ready to start work promptly once funding is available.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The applicant provides only non-specific quality assurance measures, presumably leaving the details to a Quality Assurance Team, without naming these individuals or their credentials. Similarly, the Applicant indicates that "where available, and applicable, published ASTM, and USGS standards will be followed without naming particular standards or the critical points where these standards will be applied to the project. The applicant indicates that Dr. Graham Fogg will be retained to "provide advice on hydrologic and other aspects of the project," but does not indicate Dr. Fogg's specific expertise or professional qualifications for this role.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant indicates that for three previous grants, it has successfully met all grantor requirements and completed each project on schedule and within budget, but provides no back-up documentation to support these claims.